

Income tax under the amendment would be paid by citizens of New York. That is undoubtedly true, but there is all the more reason why our legislature should take special care to exclude every narrow and selfish motive from influence upon its action and should consider the proposal in a spirit of broad national patriotism and should act upon it for the best interests of the whole country.

"The main reason why the citizens of New York will pay so large a part of the tax is that New York City is the chief financial and commercial center of a great country with vast resources and industrial activity. For many years Americans engaged in developing the wealth of all parts of the country have been going to New York to secure capital and market their securities and to buy their supplies. Thousands of men who have amassed fortunes in all sorts of enterprises in other states have gone to New York to live because they like the life of the city or because their distant enterprises require representation at the financial center.

"The incomes of New York are in a great measure derived from the country at large. A continual stream of wealth sets toward the great city from the mines and manufactories and railroads outside of New York. The United States is no longer a mere group of separate communities embraced in a political union; it has become a product of organic growth, a vast industrial organization covering and including the whole country; and the relation of New York City to the whole organization of which it is a part is the great source of her wealth and the chief reason why her citizens will pay so great a part of an income tax. We have the wealth, because behind the city stands the country. We ought to be willing to share the burdens of a national government in the same proportion in which we share its benefits.

"The circumstances that originally justified the establishment of the rule of apportionment have long since passed away. It is universally conceded that its application to existing conditions would be so unjust and inequitable as to be impossible. The power of taxation which the rule makes it impossible for the nation to exercise may be again, as it has once been, vital to the preservation of national existence. It would be most unfortunate if the several states of the union were to insist upon the continuance of this unjust and useless limitation upon the necessary powers originally and wisely granted to the national government."

An Albany dispatch quotes Senator Davenport, who received the Root letter, as saying that a difference of legal opinion between two men of the caliber of Senator Root and Governor Hughes had in it no element whatever of personal controversy. Yet nothing could be clearer, he said, than the line of cleavage between the two opinions.

"Speaking for myself," said Senator Davenport, "I do not regard this difference of view between legal experts, important as it is, as at all fundamental in the final determination of this issue. I think it will turn out to be pretty nearly the universal opinion of the economists and experts in practical finance that the governor's fears are ill grounded. No harm can come to the credit of state or municipal bonds through the levying of a general income tax. There remains of course the selfish consideration that the state of New York, with its great ability, would be called upon to pay a considerable portion of an income tax. But this unworthy consideration is so thoroughly demolished by Senator Root in the closing paragraph of his letter that hereafter it ought to hide its diminished head."

A BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A Washington dispatch says that Secretary MacVeagh estimates that there will be a deficiency of more than \$34,000,000 in the ordinary receipts of the government for the fiscal year of 1910. But they could cut down their expenditures \$34,000,000 and still be a quarter of a billion dollars too high, according to Senator Aldrich, in their expenditures. If they can not reach Aldrich's figures of economy they might try a thirty-four million dollar reduction. Surely a party that in addition to being a "God and morality" party, is the "business man's party" ought to be able to handle a little financial problem like this.

To all subscribers who renew their subscriptions to *The Commoner* during the month of March we will send the *American Homestead* one year, without additional charge. The two papers will be sent to different addresses upon request.

Where the Old Ship is Leaking

A REPUBLICAN'S PLAIN TALK

If Curtis Guild's editorial denunciation of J. Pierpont Morgan, recently printed in the *Commercial Bulletin* of Boston, had been written by a prominent democrat instead of by a republican ex-governor of Massachusetts, what a howl of "demagogue, socialist and anarchist" would have gone up from the republican press of New England. Editor Guild described Mr. Morgan as a "beefy, thick necked bully, drunk with financial power" and charged him with defiantly breaking the laws of Massachusetts. He adds that opposition to Morgan and to Morgan rule is a part of a movement which will develop into a national propaganda for the people's rights. Language such as that on the part of Mr. Bryan, Senator Tillman or any other prominent democrat would be greeted with sneers by our political opponents. What can they say when it comes not only from a republican of Guild's standing but from a man who represents the real old fashioned, Harvard college, back bay aristocracy of the most conservative northern state in the union? Guild's outbreak is but a sign of the present division in the ranks of the dominant party, a division which speaks well for its conscience and integrity and proves that there is still left in it a little of the spirit of Lincoln and that the sordid policy of commercialism which has so long dominated it does not appeal to all of its members. The republican party may hold together for a long time, the patronage, its prestige, the cornering within it of the great business interests, all make for cohesion, but it will lose many of its most valued members unless it substitutes patriotism for dollar chasing.—*The Maine Democrat*, Waterville, Maine.

Washington, D. C., February 28.—Representative Lindbergh, of Minnesota, a republican insurgent, aroused by the refusal of Postmaster General Hitchcock to accept his recommendations for postoffice appointments, has written the latter a letter in which he calls him a "political dictator" and denounces him for an alleged effort to defeat Lindbergh's renomination. Mr. Lindbergh charges in substance that Postmaster General Hitchcock has entered into an alliance with the stalwarts of the Sixth Minnesota district to prevent his re-nomination.

The Minnesota congressman says there has been an effort to make it appear that he is not for President Taft's legislative program, which he denies in his letter, and says that he "favors the president's progressive ideas," but does not trust "with implicit confidence Cannon's and Aldrich's espousal of the progressive cause." He refers to the latter as a "great burden to the republican party and the people."—*Associated Press Report*.

ROOSEVELT WON'T TALK!

Gondokoro, Soudan, February 27.—Theodore Roosevelt and his party spent today in resting. When they arrived here last evening on the Belgian gunboat *Boch* they were tired from their few days' hunt for giant elands.

An effort was made to get Colonel Roosevelt to make a statement about American politics and public affairs generally, but he emphatically refused to talk on such subjects, saying that he has completely lost touch with the outside world and must have a chance to inform himself fully before expressing an opinion about anything.—*New York World* cablegram.

AND FROM A REPUBLICAN, TOO

To the Editor of the *North American*: In today's editorial you state that the people have not lost faith in the president's integrity, but in his ability. You are mistaken. The people are next, and make no mistake about it. The president has the ability, but is using it for the interests. President Taft has been in public life too long to be the victim of grafting politicians. His trade has been a game of politics since he left college. His father before him, and, in fact, the whole Taft family have been feeding at the "public crib" in some manner, like the lords of England.

Integrity! Tell me that a president that comes into New York or Boston before election and assures the "stock jobbers of Wall Street" that he will keep his foot on the "soft pedal," but goes out west and in his own state promising his people with all the emotion possible, that

the policies of our beloved president will be carried out with dispatch. Oh! what's the use of wasting ink to tell the story, as all of the boys "on the road" know.

It is simply a positive case of giving the people the "double cross" and for heaven's sake stop using such words about President Taft. He is your servant by contract for four years, and not king, and if you had an employe on the North American that stole your manuscripts and sold you out to a crowd of "blackmailers," you wouldn't use soft words, would you?

President Taft deserves the same lashing you gave Weaver, or any one else, and if we had the power of recall the president would be fired so quick that he wouldn't have time to smile.

HENRY BERGEY.

New York, February 18.

WILSON AND PINCHOT CLASH

Washington, March 1.—The expected clash between Gifford Pinchot and Secretary of Agriculture Wilson in the dispute on the question as to whether or not the secretary had given the former forester permission to write to Senator Dolliver the letter which resulted in Mr. Pinchot's dismissal, came today before the Ballinger-Pinchot investigation committee.

Mr. Pinchot declared he had discussed the matter at length with Secretary Wilson and that he understood his superior officer had given him express permission to write to Senator Dolliver.

Secretary Wilson immediately took the stand and asserted that while he had given Mr. Pinchot permission to write to Senator Dolliver concerning "departmental" affairs, he never did and never would have given him permission to write a letter criticising the president of the United States.

Under a cross-examination, almost wholly by the democratic members of the committee, Secretary Wilson was uncertain as to just what had passed between himself and the forester and became somewhat mixed at times as to just what letter committeemen were referring to in their rapid fire of questions. The secretary repeatedly said he never saw or heard of the letter Mr. Pinchot wrote until it was read in the senate.

Mr. Pinchot had been reluctant to testify to anything that would bring him into controversy with the chief under whom he had served twelve years. But Chairman Nelson insisted he should go into the matter.

Mr. Pinchot declared that he and Secretary Wilson went so far as to discuss the executive order issued by President Taft forbidding subordinate officers of the various departments giving information to members of congress and said the secretary had said "you and I will have no trouble about that order."

Admitting that his memory failed him as to certain points, Secretary Wilson always came back to the statement that he never, under any circumstances, would have given Mr. Pinchot permission to write the letter which caused his separation from the service.

The secretary said he requested Mr. Pinchot not to carry out his purpose to "blanket" a message from the president exonerating Ballinger by sending in a letter to Senator Dolliver.

"But," persisted counsel for Mr. Pinchot, "if Mr. Pinchot was only to be permitted to write about departmental matters, how would you have thought this letter would blanket the president's message?"

"I don't know, that was Pinchot's idea."

The day was replete with incidents. The cross-examination of Mr. Pinchot was begun late in the afternoon and will be continued when the committee meets again Friday.

Mr. Pinchot denied that he had been embittered by a dismissal which he considered was not justified. He denied, also, that there was a specific movement to discredit Mr. Ballinger. He added, however, that Former Secretary Garfield and Glavis and others are concerned in a movement for the conservation of natural resources and they regarded Mr. Ballinger as one of the greatest enemies of that movement.

"If a subordinate of mine had taken the action Mr. Ballinger did," declared Mr. Pinchot dramatically, "I would have dismissed him either for corruption or incompetence and I would not have cared which. But the president made no reference to that action."

"And the property value involved was how much?" suggested Attorney Pepper.

"From fifty to a hundred millions of dollars."

"What further have you to say about the Ronald letter and the charges you based thereon," asked Mr. Pepper.

"I believe Mr. Ballinger sent that letter to the president because he wanted the president